

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are the pending claims. In the Office Action, Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,085,591 to Gancarcik et al. in view of Pub. US 2003/0197488 A1 of Hulvey; Claims 3, 4, 5 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gancarcik et al. in view of Hulvey and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,638 to Larsson or U.S. Patent No. 6,795,688 to Plasson; and Claims 7-10 were rejected “for the same reasons as set forth in claims 1-6 [sic, 1-5], as method.” (Office Action, page 4.)

Claims 1, 7 and 12 have been amended. No new subject matter is presented.

In the present invention, when a wired phone receives a wired communication request signal via a Bluetooth module, a Bluetooth wireless terminal communicates with wired network via the wired phone. In contrast, Gancarcik et al. discloses a configuration in which a PDA and a telephone set communicate via a two-way series communication link.

Claims 1 and 7 are the pending independent claims. The invention of Claim 1 provides a Bluetooth wireless terminal for transmitting a communication request signal to a wired phone via a Bluetooth module upon receiving an ID key. Gancarcik et al. teaches a Personal Digital Assistant (PDA) that provides various telephony applications that “may be pre-stored within the PDA14 or downloaded from the application server 104.” (Gancarcik et al., Col. 4, lines 26-27.) In Gancarcik et al., information from the PDA is transmitted either by “wired connection communication protocol such as USB or RS-232 protocol or a wireless communication protocol such as Bluetooth or IrDA.” (Gancarcik et al., Col. 3, lines 1-3.)

In regard to independent Claim 1, the Examiner alleged that Gancarcik et al. discloses “connecting the Bluetooth wireless terminal 14 with a wired network upon

receiving the communication request signal.” (Office Action, page 2.) Applicant respectfully disagrees. However, Gancarcik et al. fails to disclose or suggest transmitting a communication request signal to a wired phone via the Bluetooth module upon receiving the ID key, as recited in Claim 1. Neither Hulvey nor the other cited portions of Gancarcik et al. cures this defect.

Claim 7, which is the other pending independent claim, was rejected for the same reasons as set discussed above, and accordingly are also patentable over the cited art. In addition, Claim 7 recites that connection of the Bluetooth wireless terminal for wired communication via the wired phone is performed only *if the Bluetooth wireless terminal is previously registered*. Neither Gancarcik et al. nor Hulvey, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest this further recitation.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-5 and 7-11, are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, it is requested that the Examiner contact Applicant’s attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul V. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM
333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475